# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

JEFFREY T. STRAUSS, derivatively on behalf of AFFILIATED COMPUTER SERVICES, INC.,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	Civil Action No
JEFFREY A. RICH, MARK A. KING, and AFFILIATED COMPUTER SERVICES, INC., Defendants.	

## COMPLAINT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Jeffrey T. Strauss ("Strauss"), by its undersigned attorneys, complaining of defendants, alleges the following upon information and belief, except as to paragraph 1:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Strauss is a New York resident who is the owner of Class A common stock of Affiliated Computer Services, Inc. ("Affiliated" or the "Company").
- 2. Affiliated, a nominal defendant herein, is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2828 North Haskell Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204.
- 3. Defendant Jeffrey A. Rich ("Rich"), is the former Chief Executive Officer and a former director of the Company, having resigned effective September 29, 2005.

  Pursuant to an agreement with the Company, Rich continues to serve as an employee of

the Company and maintains an office at the Company's headquarters located at 2828 North Haskell Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204.

Defendant Mark A. King ("King") is the President and Chief Executive 4. Officer and is a director of the Company. King maintains an office at the Company's headquarters located at 2828 North Haskell Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This action is brought derivatively on behalf of Affiliated pursuant to 5. §16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §78p ("§16(b)" or "Section 16(b)"), to obtain disgorgement of profits obtained by defendants in violation of that statute. Jurisdiction of this court and venue in this district are proper pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §78(a)(a).

#### THE GOVERNING LAW

- Section 16(b) of the Exchange Act provides that if a person, who is an 6. officer or director of an issuer of a class of registered equity securities, purchases and sells or sells and purchases shares of any equity security of such issuer within a period of less than six months, any profits arising from those transactions are recoverable by the issuer or by a shareholder suing derivatively on its behalf.
- SEC Rule 16b-3(d) provides an exemption for "transactions between an 7. issuer and its officers or directors" if the transaction satisfies certain conditions. The Rule requires, inter alia, that the Board or a committee of non-employee directors of the Board approve the transaction in advance and in good faith, as a gate-keeper, with an eye toward preventing speculative abuse by its officers and directors. The Securities and

Exchange Commission noted in the Release proposing the Rule that it sought to craft a rule that, consistent with the statutory purpose of Section 16(b), erected meaningful safeguards against the abuse of inside information by officers and directors without impeding their participation in legitimate compensatory transactions. Ownership Reports and Trading by Officers, Directors and Principal Stockholders, Exchange Act Release No. 36356, 60 Fed. Reg. 53832, 53835, 60 SEC Docket 1393, 1396, 1995 WL 597472 at \*3, \*7 (Oct. 11, 1995).

#### BACKKGROUND

8. On or about March 6, 2006, the Company filed a Form 8-K with the Securities and Exchange Commission reporting that the SEC was conducting an investigation into the Company's option grant practices for the period from October 1998 through March 2005. In light of the SEC's investigation and based upon a review of options granted by the Company to Rich and King in 2000 and 2002, the 2000 and 2002 grants were improperly backdated to improperly reflect a grant date on which the Company's stock price was lower than on the actual grant date in order to improperly grant options with a lower exercise price. Rich was granted options to purchase 100,000 shares effective July 11, 2000 at an exercise price of \$32.875 per share; Rich was granted additional options to purchase 400,000 shares effective July 23, 2002 at an exercise price of \$35.75 per share; and King was granted options to purchase 200,000 shares effective July 23, 2002 at an exercise price of \$35.75 per share. Each of these grants was improperly backdated to improperly take advantage of historically low trading prices of the Company's stock.

- 9. Rich and King caused the Company to improperly price the stock options to benefit themselves. In particular, the artificial grant dates provided Rich and King with lower exercise prices. Because the Company used artificial grant dates, these stock option grants were not granted in conformance with the requirements of the Company's stock option plans and were not properly approved by the Company under SEC Rule 16b-3(d). Under SEC Rule 16b-6(a) and (c), these option grants are therefore deemed to be purchases of the same number of shares underlying the options at a price per share equal to the market price on the actual date of the grants. These purchase prices are believed to be \$33.25 in the case of the option granted effective July 11, 2000 and \$37.00 in the case of the options granted effective July 23, 2002.
- of the Company's stock at various times that occurred within six months of the improper Option Grants set forth above. These sale transactions took place within the statutory six month short-swing profit period prescribed by Section 16(b). More particularly, Rich sold at least 100,000 shares within the six-month statutory period of the July 2000 option grant at prices ranging between \$46 and \$64 per share, garnering short-swing profits of at least \$3 million; and sold 208,000 shares between January 29, 2002 and January 21, 2003 at prices ranging between \$44 and \$56, garnering short-swing profits of at least \$3 million. King sold 72,000 shares between May 21, 2002 and January 22, 2003 at prices ranging between \$49 and \$55, garnering short-swing profits of at least \$1.1 million.
- 11. Rich and King reported the foregoing option grants in Form 4 and Form 5 filings with the SEC, wherein they assert that these option grants were exempt from the statute under SEC Rule 16b-3(d). 17 C.F.R. § 240.16b-3(d)(1). Because the options

4

were not granted in accordance with the terms of the governing options plans and were improperly backdated, this exemption is unavailable.

# **DEFENDANTS' OPTION GRANTS ARE** NON-EXEMPT PURCHASES UNDER SECTION 16(b)

Because the option grants referred to above were not properly approved by 12. the Company's Compensation Committee, these option grants are not exempt under SEC Rule 16b-3(d) and constitute non-exempt purchases under Section 16(b). See, Gryl v. Shire Pharmaceuticals Group PLC, 298 F. 3d 136,141 (2d Cir. 2002).

#### AS AND FOR A CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges each of the allegations contained in 13. paragraphs 1 through 12 as if fully set forth herein.
- At all relevant times, each of Rich and King was an officer or director of 14. the Company.
- Under Section 16(b), the option grants received by Rich and King were 15. purchases, and are matchable with the respective sales made by Rich and King within the six-month statutory period.
- As a result, Rich garnered short-swing profits in excess of \$6 million, 16. which is subject to disgorgement; and King garnered short-swing profits in excess of \$1.1 million, which is subject to disgorgement.

#### ALLEGATION AS TO DEMAND

Plaintiff has not made demand on the Company to commence this action 17. because such demand would be futile. Defendants control the Company and its Board of Directors, and it is believed that they will not take action against their own interests. Moreover, prompt action is required to avoid a possible bar to the claims asserted herein under the governing two year statute of limitations.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment on behalf of Affiliated Computer Services. Inc. against defendants, as described above, plus attorneys' fees, interest and such other and further relief as to the Court may seem just and proper.

Dated: Wilmington, Delaware May 16, 2006

FERRY, JOSEPH & PEARCE, P.A.

Theodore J. Tacconelli (No. 2678)

824 Market Street

Suite 904, P.O. Box 1351

Wilmington, Delaware 109899

(302) 575-1555

Local Counsel for Plaintiff

OF COUNSEL:

PAUL D. WEXLER, ESQ. BRAGAR WEXLER & EAGEL, P.C. 885 Third Avenue New York, New York 10022 (212) 308-5858

-and-

GLENN F. OSTRAGER, ESQ. OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN P.C. 250 Park Avenue New York, New York 10177-0899

Counsel for Plaintiff

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

**DEFENDANTS** 

JEFFREY T. STRAUSS, derivatively on behalf of AFFILIATED COMPUTER SERVICES, INC.,  (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff NA  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				JEFFREY A. RICH, MARK A. KING, and AFFILIATED COMPUTER SERVICES, INC., County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE								
Theor	) Attorney's (Firm Name, Adore J. Taccor ce, 824 Market BASIS OF JURISDI U.S. Government Plaintiff	elli St. CTION	, Esq., Fei , P.O. Box N (Place an "X" in O Federal Question (U.S. Government N	rry, Joseph 1351, Wilm: One Box Only)	ingto	Attorneys (If Known  DE 19899  CITIZENSHIP OF  (For Diversity Cases Only  izen of This State	(30 PRI	DEI	575–1555 PAL PARTII	and One Box for Principal Place This State	One Box for Orefendar PTF	or Plaintiff ant)  DEF  0 4
<b>1</b> 2	U.S. Government Defendant	<b>□</b> 4	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	p of Parties in Item III)	Cit	izen of Another State	☐ 2 ☐ 3		2 Incorporated a of Business 3 Foreign Nation	In Another State	 6	<b>0</b> 6
TX 7	NATION OF CHIT	1				Foreign Country						
17.	NATURE OF SUIT	(Place a	n "X" in One Box Only TOR		FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	edaj w	В	ANKRUPTCY	ОТНЕ	R STATUT	ES
12 13 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	O Insurance O Marine O Marine O Miller Act O Negotiable Instrument O Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment I Medicare Act 2 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 3 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits O Stockholders' Suits O Other Contract 5 Contract Product Liability Franchise REAL PROPERTY O Land Condemnation O Foreclosure O Rent Lease & Ejectment O Torts to Land 5 Tort Product Liability O All Other Real Property	310 A	ONAL INJURY Airplane Airplane Product iability Assault, Libel & lander Federal Employers' iability Marine Marine Product iability Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle Product Liability Other Personal njury VIL RIGHTS Voting Employment Housing/ Accommodations Welfare Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUF  362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin 380 Other Personal Property Damag 785 Property Damag Product Liability PRISONER PETITIC 510 Motions to Vacasente Habeas Corpus: 530 General 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & C	RY O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 88 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relatior 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reportin & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	31 Constant	9 423 W 28 PRO 1 820 C 1 830 P 1 840 T 5 861 F 1 862 E 1 863 E 1 864 S 1 865 F F F D 1 871 I	ppeal 28 USC 158 Vithdrawal B USC 157  PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights atent rademark  IAL SECURITY IIA (1395ff) Black Lung (923) DIWC/DIWW (405(S) SID Title XVI SI (405(g)) ERAL TAX SUITS Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff Defendant) RS—Third Party 5 USC 7609	470 Racket   Corrupi   480 Consu   490 Cable/   810 Selecti   580 Securi   5 Exchan   12 USC   12 USC   12 USC   13 891 Agricu   891 Agricu   892 Econo   893 Envir   894 Energ   895 Freedc   895 Freedc   4ct   900Appeal	and Bankin erree tation teer Influence to Transizati mer Challen C Sat TV ive Service ties/Commo ge mer Challen C 3410 Statutory A altural Acts mic Stabiliz commental My Allocatior om of Inform of of Fee Det Equal Acce ice itutionality ttatutes	ng codities/ odities/ nge actions zation Act fatters n Act mation termination
V. ⊠1	Original 2 R	temoved	<del>rt</del>	Appellate Court	are filin	einstated or an eopened (sp g (Do not cite jurisdict	other pecify tional	rred fro distric	t Multi Litig		Appeal to Judge fro Magistra Judgmen	o District om ite it
VI.	VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  15 U.S.C. Section 78p [Section 16(b)]  Brief description of cause:  Derivative Action											
VI	VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☐ No											
VI	VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY  (See instructions): JUDGE  DOCKET NUMBER											
	May 16, 2006			SIGNATURE OF A	ATTORN	EY OF RECORD	liv	hu				
	R OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUNT		APPLYING IFP		JUDGI	E		MAC	G. JUDGE		-

Theodore Tacconelli
(Printed name of Party or their Representative)

AO FORM 85 RECEIPT (REV. 9/04)		
United States	District Court for the District	of Delaware
	Civil Action No.	06-318
ACK	NOWLEDGMENT	1
	CIPT FOR AO FOR	-
NOTICE (	OF AVAILABILITY	OF A
UNITED STA	<u>ATES MAGISTRATI</u>	E JUDGE
TO EXE	RCISE JURISDICT	<u>ION</u>
	· · · · · ·	
I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE REC	CEIPT OF COP	IES OF AO FORM 85.
		•
5/16/06	Shalut -	
(Date forms issued)	(Signature of Party or	heir Representative)

Note: Completed receipt will be filed in the Civil Action